



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Although this translation of Holberg cannot be regarded as distinguished, it is in the main correct, but it is not Holberg. The raciness of Holberg's dialog is lost. Whether it is possible to preserve the real flavor of the Danish author in an English translation is another question.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois.

MILTON AND JAKOB BOEHME. A study of German Mysticism in Seventeenth-Century England. By Margaret Lewis Bailey, Ph.D., sometime Fellow at the University of Illinois. In *Germanic Literature and Culture*, A Series of Monographs, edited by Julius Goebel. New York, Oxford University Press, 1914. Pp. vii, 200.

This instructive and promising monograph is the first of a series, whose plan, says the general editor, "does not limit its scope to German literature, but includes also the literatures and civilizations of the peoples of kindred origin." The choice of subject for the initial volume is doubtless as characteristic as it is fortunate, since it betrays Professor Goebel's own fruitful interest in German Neoplatonism, while it reminds us that from him and his circle of friends and scholars at Urbana we may expect further significant studies of English and German mystics. The comforting thought leads one on to the pious wish that some philosophical philologist might trace the history of Neoplatonism, not for German literature alone, nor yet primarily for this and related literatures, including English; what we need is a systematic history, beginning with Plotinus and his origins, taking account of Jewish and Alexandrian sources, and coming down the centuries—but with especial reference to the literature of the Middle Ages and, in the Renaissance, to literature south of the Alps. The ideal work would be more comprehensive, and more concerned with poetry, than the excellent essay of Whittaker (*The Neoplatonists*, Cambridge, 1901); it might be a study of Plotinus, on the order of Zielinski's *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*. At all events, we need some general sketch of the influence of Neoplatonism, not simply for students of philosophy, but for literary students, who, when they encounter Neoplatonic ideas in Dante, or Milton, or Wordsworth, cannot immediately appraise them, for want of a satisfactory standard. Such an outline would supply that perspective which the reviewer craves—and which Miss Bailey does not quite possess.

Her monograph, representing labors for the doctorate at the University of Illinois, supplemented by a year of study abroad, consists of an Introduction, five other chapters, and a Bibliography.

The introductory chapter gives a cursory survey of Neoplatonism, with emphasis upon German mystics, leading up to Boehme. Chapter II treats of English mysticism before Boehme, and prepares for Chapter III (the longest), which deals with the spread of his writings in England after the year 1644, and with the prevalence of ideas similar to his in various individuals and sects. These two chapters, with the Bibliography, constitute the most valuable parts of the work. They may be consulted with profit by a student of Milton, or of the period, for the light they throw upon the background of popular thought, religious and otherwise, in England during the seventeenth century. But, be it noted, the word "popular" is here used advisedly; for Miss Bailey tends to stress the influence from the side of the Reformation, which was an influence through popular leaders upon the masses, and to neglect the influences from the side of traditional learning—from the Platonism and Neoplatonism of the universities and of Italy. Thus, in the case of Milton, a writer for the fit though few, she slights the debt to Spenser, who, as Milton told Dryden, was his "original," who, like Milton, was devoted to the study of Plato, and whose poems are full of Italian Neoplatonism. Though she mentions Giordano Bruno, she says nothing of his visiting England in 1583; yet this is one of the capital incidents in the history of English mysticism. And in touching on a later period, if she speaks of Henry More, she does not even allude to Cudworth. One must flatly say that she seems to have formed no just estimate of the revival of Platonic studies among the learned, or of Milton's possible participation therein.

Chapter IV contains a discussion of the grounds for believing that Milton must have been acquainted with the writings of Boehme. While Miss Bailey has found no direct evidence of this—no specific or obvious reference to any work of Boehme in any of the works of Milton, or in his early biographers,—she makes out a plausible case on the basis of probabilities; and, though Milton commonly gives unmistakable indications respecting the authors to whom he is indebted, the present writer is not unwilling to believe that the English poet was aware of the German mystic. Yet it would be easy to divert some of the indirect evidence in support of the opposite contention. Let us suppose that Milton's orthodoxy begins to wane, and his belief to verge toward Arianism,¹ about 1644, the year of "the first printed mention in England of Jakob Boehme"; if so the coincidence would be too close to be significant, since Milton's change of position was not hasty. It is argued that the poet could read German; but it is obvious that he occupied himself far more with Italian, not to speak of French, or of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. It is

¹The term "Arianism" does not occur in the monograph; I have in mind passages on pp. 57, 119, but I describe Milton's theology in the light of Bishop Welldon's article on the subject—see the reference near the end of this review.

argued that he was on friendly terms with Hartlib; but it is not clear that Hartlib's Neoplatonism was entirely derived from Boehme; and Milton's disparaging allusion to Comenius is not reassuring as to his sympathy with other German authors that Hartlib might recommend.

Chapter V, on the "Similarity between Milton and Boehme in Religious, Philosophical, and Political Ideas," contains many parallel passages, with intent to show that *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and the treatise called *The Christian Doctrine* are heavily indebted to the German mystic. Some of these parallels are very interesting, and some are forced. I found the one at the bottom of page 154 and top of page 155 convincing enough until I ran across the same thing in Plotinus.² In the sixth and concluding chapter, the Neoplatonism of Milton, derived according to Miss Bailey from Boehme, is regarded as the first sign of "Romanticism" in England; the general notion is excellent, but the particular lineage too specific. There follows a Bibliography, in the main devoted to Boehme, and particularly useful for the information on English translations and editions of his works. Finally, there is an Index, in which proper names greatly predominate over topics.

It is easy to see that the author of the monograph is much more deeply interested in Boehme than in Milton; and though her immediate familiarity with the text of Milton may be deemed sufficient, the knowledge she displays concerning what he read, and concerning what Neoplatonic writers he *may* have read aside from Boehme, is inadequate to the sort of comparison she has instituted in Chapter V. This is not to deny the value of the comparison, for I wish to insist that it has a real value. Nor is the fault entirely hers. Great discredit must attach to English scholarship so long as there is no first-rate edition of Milton's prose works, fully annotated and indexed (which would afford a conspectus of his authorities), and so long as there is no guide, even in bare outline, to his reading; no such guide, for example, as we have for Shakespeare in the work of Anders.³ But Miss Bailey hardly intimates that Milton read anything save Boehme and the Bible. Yet of other Renaissance writers she says: "Everard quotes Plato, Plotinus, Proclus, Origines, Dionysius, St. Augustine, St. Bernhard, St. Francis" (p. 45); Rous "quotes Thomas à Kempis, St. Bernhard, and Dionysius the Areopagite" (p. 46); Henry More (1614-1687—compare the dates of Milton, 1608-1674) "read Proclus and Plotinus," "Dionysius the Areo-

² *Select Works of Plotinus*, tr. Taylor, ed. Mead, London, 1914, pp. 226 ff.

³ *Shakespeare's Books*, by H. R. D. Anders. I do not forget the excellent editions of separate works of Milton, prepared under the direction of Professor Cook at Yale. And it is proper to note that Dr. Allan H. Gilbert of Cornell has made, and hopes shortly to publish, a list of all the books which Milton is known to have consulted.

pagite was one of his dearest friends," and "he was steeped in the sincere mysticism of the *Theologica Germanica*" (p. 49). Indeed, she cites with approval (p. 30) the statement of Troeltsch that the system of Boehme himself, in certain respects, was founded upon impressions from Paracelsus, Schwenkfeld, and Weigel, adding that Troeltsch "might well mention Sebastian Franck also."

If Boehme, with his scanty education, drew ideas from more sources than the industry of scholars as yet has laid bare, what shall we say of Milton? This is not the place to discuss the industrious and select reading which is everywhere evinced in *Paradise Lost*; nor even to point out the main channels through which Milton obtained those Neoplatonic conceptions that Miss Bailey has done well to indicate. Nevertheless, a few remarks on the topic may be ventured. Milton's Neoplatonism is not likely to have come from any one source—neither from Spenser, nor from Dante, nor yet from his own interpretation of Plato. But more of it probably came from such authors as Plotinus, Philo Judaeus, Proclus, Porphyry, Origen, and St. Augustine, that is, from the true Neoplatonists and the Fathers, than from writers of his own time. And his demonology and angelology, when they do not reflect the Bible or his gleanings (of which we know so little) from Hebrew commentators on the Talmud, and the like, find closer analogues in mediæval theorists such as Michael Psellus and the Pseudo-Dionysius than in any author of the Renaissance.⁴ Of the men of learning near to him in point of time, aside from interpreters of the Bible like Calvin, and poets (above all, Spenser), he doubtless owes most to the Italians. It is useless for Miss Bailey to say (p. 117) that his journey to Italy "was entirely one of artistic and literary stimulation," if she thereby means to dismiss the possibility of a direct influence from Italian Platonists and Neoplatonists. On page 7 she remarks: "Under the patronage of Cosimo de Medici . . . Marsilius Ficinus (1433-1499) made masterly translations of Plato and Plotinus and various other Neoplatonists. He interpreted Plato entirely according to the spirit of Plotinus, and consciously attempted to bring their philosophy into accord with Christian doctrine." When Milton at Venice put on board a ship destined for England the books he had collected in Italy, the notable work of Ficino on Plato was doubtless among them, unless he had access to it previously during his study of the dialogues at Horton. And there is reason to suppose that he knew the little tract of "the Platonic Constanti-

⁴ Milton could find a use, however, for a compendious work like that of Thomas Heywood, *The Hierarchie of the Blessed Angells, Their Names, Orders, and Offices, The Fall of Lucifer with his Angells* (London, 1635), in which authors of every period are freely quoted; as we know he found a use for the compendious work on geography, *Purchas his Pilgrimage*, containing digested materials from many sources.

nopolitan Michael Psellus" (as Coleridge calls him), *Περὶ Ἐνεργείας Δαιμόνων*, of which Ficino published a text and a Latin translation.

So much in general. We may now take up a few matters in particular. It must account for many similarities in Milton and Boehme when we realize the substantial truth of what we read on page 163: "Boehme's only authority is the Bible"; and "in his *Christian Doctrine* Milton's only authority is the Bible." There assuredly they have something in common not only with each other, but with seventeenth-century Protestantism as a whole. But when we read (p. 146): "So there is in God an eternal contrariety or opposition of forces"; we must add: if such be the notion of Boehme, he is in this not very much like Milton. And again, Boehme's conception (p. 143) of the Divine Being as "in Himself the Abyss [or Chaos] . . . an Eternal Nothing" is not Miltonic. If "the mystery of evil was the keynote of Boehme's thought" (p. 100), the same is not true of Milton. Milton does not deem the Godhead to be "the abyss out of which all being issues . . . the eternal silence, the All and No-thing"; nor is there for Milton "an eternal contrast" "in God's own hidden nature" (p. 26).⁵ These are ultra-Neoplatonic ideas, much older than Boehme, however he may have come by them; Milton is touched with Neoplatonism, not dominated by it. Again, if war was "an abomination" for Boehme (p. 29), it was not so for Milton, either in the tractate *Of Education*, or in *Samson Agonistes*.

One cannot therefore go so far as to agree with Miss Bailey that "Milton penetrated into 'the Teutonic philosophy,' beneath the veil of language that obscured its meaning, and became one of the first to share Boehme's *Weltanschauung*." For example, one cannot agree with her opinion that "Milton thinks of the Godhead not as a personal God" (p. 141), especially when one recalls the fashion in which *The Christian Doctrine* was exclusively compiled from the Bible. Nor may we concede that "a first evidence of Milton's interest in Boehme is his choice of the full subject of his great poems *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*." The subjects of Milton were not the special property of any one Continental writer. They were as much the property of Italians like Andreini and Vida as of the Lutheran Boehme, or of Grotius in Holland—or of Milton in England; for the best recent discussion of the point one may consult Professor Ernest N. S. Thompson's *Essays on Milton* (pp. 170-196). Finally, when Miss Bailey says of the main conception in *Paradise Regained*, "There is no other source than Boehme from which he [Milton] could have obtained this idea of the temptation" (pp. 160-161), the only reply is that if Milton did not himself develop it from the Biblical account, to

⁵ A goodly collection of passages representing the chief theological positions in Milton is found in the article of Welldon to which I again refer later on.

which he is very true, he might have gathered it from a commentator on the Bible—for example, from Calvin.⁶

It is hoped that the reviewer's respect for this monograph will not be hidden by the foregoing strictures, nor by the following objections to minor details. It is preferable to call Milton's tractate, not *On Education*, but *Of Education*. On page 116, for the word "scholastic" substitute "scholarly." On page 140 are the words, "The epic, which incorporated *some* of these early speeches";—the italics are mine. Unless the passage refers to Milton's preliminary drafts or arguments, which were not "incorporated" in *Paradise Lost*, one speech must be what is intended—that is, Satan's apostrophe to the sun, *P. L.* 4.32 ff. The material on J. V. Andreae and his works, pp. 16 ff., is not well inserted. Miss Bailey begins again on page 20: "Another of the Germans whose life had received new inspiration from his Italian journey was Johann Valentin Andreae"; as if he had not previously been mentioned. On page 63, line 2, delete the comma in "Raymundus, Lullius"; on page 106, a word seems to have dropped out of the phrase "for excellent gift"; and on page 73, lines 1, 2, "Marcaria" doubtless is a misprint for "Macaria."

In the Bibliography, the brief list of works on Milton ought probably to include the volume of *Studies in Milton* by Alden Sampson, and certainly the thesis of P. Chauvet, *La Religion de Milton*, Paris, 1909, and the authoritative article by Welldon on *The Theology of Milton*, in *The Nineteenth Century* for May, 1912. In the more general list at the end, one misses the work of Whitaker, and the chapter on *Platonists and Latitudinarians* by J. Bass Mullinger in Volume 8 of the *Cambridge History of English Literature*.

But we must not close with a note of censure. Miss Bailey has shown considerable power in treating a most perplexing subject; how perplexing only they can understand who have considered the elusiveness of Neoplatonic thought, its hidden ramifications, and its reappearance in the most unexpected places. She has, unquestionably, illuminated the literary history of England in the seventeenth century. She has pointed out not a few similarities between Milton and a Continental mystic—one who reflected and anticipated many ideas that are characteristic of modern poetry. More than this, she has clearly grasped the fact that much of what goes under the name of "Romanticism" is neither more nor less than Neoplatonism. It is to be hoped that she will continue her studies, and will develop the suggestions made in her final chapter. The Neoplatonism of Wordsworth is not wholly due to Henry More, nor that of Coleridge to Boehme; both Coleridge and Wordsworth, like Milton himself, were students at Cambridge; and the stream of Platonic and Neoplatonic influence in England has

⁶ Calvin, *Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists*, tr. Pringle, Edinburgh, 1845; on Matt. 4.1-11.

primarily come through the universities from Italy—until the days of Jowett, through Oxford less than Cambridge. Is this the reason why Cambridge has produced more than her share of the modern English poets?

LANE COOPER.

Cornell University.

THE RUNIC ROODS OF RUTHWELL AND BEWCASTLE, WITH A SHORT HISTORY OF THE CROSS AND CRUCIFIX IN SCOTLAND, by James King Hewison. Pp. xii, 178. Glasgow: John Smith & Son, 1914.

This is a well-printed quarto, containing nine chapters and three appendixes, in which the author traverses much of the ground occupied by my monograph, *The Date of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses* (hereafter referred to as *Date*), published in 1912, and some of that occupied by my book, *Some Accounts of the Bewcastle Cross between the Years 1607 and 1861* (referred to as *Accounts*), which has appeared since Dr. Hewison's. He follows me in rejecting the seventh century as the date of the two crosses, but his main thesis is that they were produced by St. Dunstan or under his direction, and therefore in the tenth century, instead of in the twelfth, as I had attempted to show.

The titles of the chapters are: (I) Introductory—A Short History of the Cross and Crucifix in Scotland; (II) Sites: Traditions: Emergence into History; (III) Descriptions of Ruthwell Cross and of Bewcastle Obelisk or Cross; (IV) The Inscriptions; (V) The Sculpture on both Monuments; (VI) Symbols and Doctrine; (VII) Early Art in Northumbria; (VIII) The Dates assignable to the Runic Roods; (IX) The Dream of the Rood. The appendixes are: (I) Place-Names—Ruthwell and Bewcastle; (II) The Mysterious Cynewulf; (III) Anglian and Anglo-Danish Sculpture; (IV) Weight of the Monuments. The Index is unfortunately incomplete in its citations.

The plates are numerous, and, for the most part, useful, though not always as clear as might be desired—a result due in part, perhaps, to the clouding involved in the half-tone process of reproduction. I append a list of the chief correspondences with my plates, which may be useful for comparison (Roman numbers for his, and my numbers in parenthesis, *Date* [Fig.] and *Accounts* [page] being indicated by D. and A.): I (D. 3, 15, 16, 17); IX. 1 (A. 130); IX. 2, 3 (A. 13, 14); X (D. 19; cf. 2, 20, 23); XI. I (A. 15); XI. 2 (A. 24); XII. 1, 2 (D. 33; A. 110, 71; cf. A. 37, 124); XII. 4 (D. 22); XIII, XIV. c, XXIV. A (D. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8); XIV. b (D. 15, 16, 17); XIV. a, XXIV. A (D. 12, 13, 14); XIV.